

From the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

JS

**PCT**NOTIFICATION CONCERNING  
TRANSMITTAL OF COPY OF INTERNATIONAL  
PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY  
(CHAPTER I OF THE PATENT COOPERATION  
TREATY)

(PCT Rule 44bis.1(c))

To:

FENSTER, Paul  
FENSTER & COMPANY, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
LTD.  
P. O. BOX 10256  
49002 PETACH TIKVA  
ISRAËL

RECEIVED

02 APR 2007

FILE No. 34603

G.E. EHRLICH (1996) LTD.

Date of mailing (day/month/year)

08 March 2007 (08.03.2007)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

414/04517

**IMPORTANT NOTICE**

International application No.

PCT/IL2005/000906

International filing date (day/month/year)

18 August 2005 (18.08.2005)

Priority date (day/month/year)

25 August 2004 (25.08.2004)

Applicant

REABILITY INC. et al

The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

The International Bureau of WIPO  
34, chemin des Colombettes  
1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Authorized officer

Simin Baharlou

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70

e-mail: pt09.pct@wipo.int

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

# PCT

## INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

|  |  |  |                  |
|--|--|--|------------------|
| Applicant's or agent's file reference<br>414/04517   | <b>FOR FURTHER ACTION</b>  |  | See item 4 below |
| International application No.<br>PCT/IL2005/000906   | International filing date ( <i>day/month/year</i> )<br>18 August 2005 (18.08.2005) | Priority date ( <i>day/month/year</i> )<br>25 August 2004 (25.08.2004) |                  |
| International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated)<br>See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237 |  |  |                  |
| Applicant<br>REABILITY INC.  |  |  |                  |

|   |  |              |   |
|---|--|--------------|---|
| 1.  | This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).  |              |   |
| 2.  | This REPORT consists of a total of 7 sheets, including this cover sheet.   |              |   |
| In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead. |  |              |   |
| 3.  | This report contains indications relating to the following items:  |              |   |
|   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | Box No. I    | Basis of the report   |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/>   | Box No. II   | Priority  |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/>   | Box No. III  | Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability  |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/>   | Box No. IV   | Lack of unity of invention  |
|   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | Box No. V    | Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/>   | Box No. VI   | Certain documents cited   |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/>   | Box No. VII  | Certain defects in the international application  |
|   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>  | Box No. VIII | Certain observations on the international application   |
| 4.  | The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis .2). |              |   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
| The International Bureau of WIPO<br>34, chemin des Colombettes<br>1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland<br><br>Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70 | Date of issuance of this report<br>28 February 2007 (28.02.2007)<br><br>Authorized officer<br><br><div style="text-align: center; font-weight: bold;">Simin Baharlou</div><br><br>e-mail: pt09.pct@wipo.int |
|---|---|

# PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

REC'D 13 JUN 2006

WIPO

PCT

# PCT

## WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

To:  
PAUL FENSTER  
FENSTER & COMPANY, INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LTD.  
P. O. BOX 10256  
PETACH, ISRAEL 49002

Date of mailing  
(day/month/year) **08 JUN 2006**

Applicant's or agent's file reference

414/04517

**FOR FURTHER ACTION**

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/IL05/00906

International filing date (day/month/year)

18 August 2005 (18.08.2005)

Priority date (day/month/year)

25 August 2004 (25.08.2004)

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

IPC: **A61H 1/00**( 2006.01) **A61B 5/04**( 2006.01)

USPC: 601/5,33;600/545

Applicant

REABILITY INC.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☒ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

### 2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/ US

Mail Stop PCT, Attn: ISA/US  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Facsimile No. (571) 273-3201

Date of completion of this opinion

11 April 2006 (11.04.2006)

Authorized officer

*For*  
Gregory L Huson

Telephone No. (571) 272-3700

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/IL05/00906

**Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application**

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the questions whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

Claims 11,13,19 are objected to under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(v) as lacking clarity under PCT Article 6 because the claims are indefinite for the following reason(s): They recite the phrase "said measurement," indicating that a measurement was claimed earlier. However these claims, as well as their parent claim 1 do not claim a measurement. Therefore there is a lack of antecedent basis for the "said measurement."

Claim 60 is objected to under PCT Rule 66.2(a)(v) as lacking clarity under PCT Article 6 because the claim is indefinite for the following reason(s): It is not clear what is being claimed. It seems as part (a) and part (b) are identical for they both claim the reorganization of brain functions. Furthermore, part (b) is unclear and seems to be a run on sentence. Was a comma intended to be placed between "reorganizing" and "rehabilitating?"

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.  
PCT/IL05/00906

**Supplemental Box**

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

**V.1. Reasoned Statements:**

The opinion as to Novelty was positive (Yes) with respect to claims 4,6,10-16,22,23,25,27,31,32,35-42,44,46-66,68,69,71-81  
The opinion as to Novelty was negative (No) with respect to claims 1-3,5,7-9,17-21,24,26,28-30,33,34,43,45,67,70  
The opinion as to Inventive Step was positive (Yes) with respect to claims 4,6,10-16,22,23,25,27,31,32,35-42,44,46-66,68,69,71-81  
The opinion as to Inventive Step was negative (NO) with respect to claims 1-3,5,7-9,17-21,24,26,28-30,33,34,43,45,67,70  
The opinion as to Industrial Applicability was positive (YES) with respect to claims 1-81  
The opinion as to Industrial Applicability was negative (NO) with respect to claims NONE

**V. 2. Citations and Explanations:**

Claims 1-3,5,7-9,17-21,24,26,28-30,33,34,43,45,67,70, lack novelty under PCT Article 33(2) as being anticipated by Dean, Jr. et al.

Regarding claim 1, the reference comprises a movement element capable of controlling at least one motion parameter of a portion of a patient. The reference also suggests the monitoring of brain wave activity. A data acquisition computer encompasses circuitry and includes a memory for the storage of rehabilitation information. Because the reference states that the computer "responds appropriately to the patient's state of mind," it is evident that the signal for the brain wave monitor is interrelated with the movement of the movement element as part of a rehabilitation process.

Regarding claim 2, fig. 5 shows that a limb is put into motion.

Regarding claim 3, the data acquisition computer or circuitry controls the movement element.

Regarding claim 5, force is applied the portion of a patient against his/her movement. This constitutes resistance to movement.

Regarding claim 7, the said force is adjustable from zero to greater than the user's body weight. Thus the said circuitry must measure the force before it allows its adjustment, as well as after the said adjustment.

Regarding claim 8, pre-programmed or custom exercise regimens are provided and constitute a rehabilitation plan.

Regarding claim 9, feedback to the patient's performance is provided.

Regarding claims 17,18, because the invention of the reference comprises a brain wave monitor, it is capable of sending information to the circuitry that will detect an intent, as well as a readiness to move. Based on this "state of mind" the movement element "responds appropriately."

Regarding claim 19, in response to the user's production of insufficient force (a detection of movement or lack thereof) the apparatus will decrease the force.

Regarding claim 20, the recordings of readings from electrodes placed on a user's head are known as an electroencephalogram (EEG) and represent brain waves. Thus, a brain wave monitor encompasses an EEG monitor.

Regarding claim 21, the apparatus comprises a heart rate monitor, a device that inherently measure blood flow.

Regarding claim 24, the apparatus comprises means to provide force against the movement of a portion of a patient and is controllable by the circuitry.

Regarding claim 26, a body portion can either be engaged, or disengaged from the apparatus.

Regarding claim 28, the circuitry comprises a memory that stores a patient's performance data/rehabilitation progress.

Regarding claim 29, the apparatus comprises two movement elements that the circuitry moves in opposite directions to simulate walking, thus recognizing each as being associated with opposite limbs.

Regarding claim 30,33 see rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 34, the movement of the movement element comprises a plurality of motions.



WRITTEN OPINION OF THE  
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.  
PCT/IL05/00906

**Supplemental Box**

In case the space in any of the preceding boxes is not sufficient.

Regarding claim 43,45 a user's motion is measured and recorded as part of a patient's performance data.

Regarding claim 67,70, brain activity is measured during the repeated movements of the movement element and analyzed by the circuitry.

Claims 4,6,10-16,22,23,25,27,31,32,35-42,44,46-81 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(2)-(3), because the prior art does not teach or fairly suggest the control of the direction and location of movement or a reach point by circuitry, the measurement of a parameter of motion of said movement element, a template of expected brain-motion relationship, the generation of expected motion based on the measurement of brain waves, the generation of expected brain activity based on movement, the comparison of said measurement to rehabilitation information as well as its trends, the change of a motion parameter responsive to said measurement within a time from of said movement, a fMRI brain wave monitor, a robotic manipulator, unrestricted movement in 3D space over 30cm volume, cognitive rehabilitation, brain rehabilitation, cortical reorganization, indications of brain plasticity, measuring and controlling said motion at least 10 times, repeating and controlling 20 different motions, comparing motions and measurements for a healthy side and a paretic side, measuring the quality of said motion, training the control of cortical activity, locally activating a brain region while applying treatment and delivering a drug, using external stimulation, detecting intent to carry out physical activity, a spatial manipulator, and measuring movement of a patient in response to imagery

Claims 1-81 meet the criteria set out in PCT Article 33(4), and thus have industrial applicability because the subject matter claimed can be made or used in industry.